

REMARKS

Petition to Revive

A petition to revive and required fee are being submitted herewith.

Change of Address

The January 23, 2007 was not received because it was mailed to the former Kirkland, Washington address of the undersigned, despite unambiguous direction on form PTO-1390 to correspond with the undersigned at the current address in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. A change of address form accompanies this paper, again instructing the USPTO to use the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania correspondence address. The examiner is thanked for calling the undersigned to alert him of the office action before issuing a letter of abandonment.

IDS

The office action states that a portion of the machine translation of JP 2001-1200151 was not received by the Office. If this error was due to the undersigned or the applicants (rather than a portion of the translation being lost in the Office), the error was made without intention on the part of the undersigned or applicants to withhold part of the translation. The paper file in this office contains only a complete machine translation. Although the Examiner appears to have obtained a full machine translation of this reference, an additional copy is being submitted herewith.

Regarding the claim amendments

The claim amendments proffered in the Preliminary Amendment are resubmitted in this paper, together with the required status indicators. The claim amendments are made to eliminate multiple dependencies and in some instances put the claims into better form for US practice. New claims 11-18 are supported by original claims 3-10, respectively. No additional fee for this amendment is believed to be required.

Regarding the Art Rejection

Claims 1-3 stand rejected over EP 1 188 092 in view of JP 2001-200151A. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

EP 1 188 092 does not describe a polycarbonate composition that contains a phosphazene FR additive. As pointed out by the examiner, EP 1 188 092 describes that phosphorus compounds are optional additives, but the only phosphorus compounds described are phosphate esters, not phosphazene compounds.

JP 2001-200151 describes certain phosphazene FR additives that are used in polycarbonate compositions, but not in conjunction with the particular branched silicone compound, organometallic salt and fluorine-containing polymer required in this invention.

Applicants have found that the phosphazene compounds work unexpectedly well when used in conjunction with the particular silicone compound specified by the claims, an organometallic salt and a fiber-forming fluorine-containing compound. This is described in the present specification, by comparing Example 1 on the one hand with Comparative Examples 1-3, and by Comparing Example 4 with Comparative Example 8.

Example 1 differs from Comparative Exmaples 1-3 only in the selection of phosphorus compounds. In Example 1, a phosphazene is used, whereas in Comparative Examples 1-3, a phosphate ester, similar to that described in EP 1 188 092, is used. A V-O rating is obtained in Example 1, whereas an "NR" rating is obtain in each of Comparative Examples 1-3. Note also that a very large loss of impact strength is seen when the phosphate ester is substituted for the phophazene compound. Deflection temperature under load also declines when the phosphate ester is used instead of the phosphazene compound.

A similar trend is seen in comparing Example 4 with Comparative Sample 8. Again, these differ only in the use of a phosphazene compound in Example 4 versus a phosphate ester in Comparative Example 8. This time, flame retardance decreases from V-O to "NR", notched Izod impact decreases dramatically and deflection temperature under load is reduced, when a phosphate ester is used instead of a phosphazene compound. (An "NR" rating means that the sample failed to even meet the criteria for a "V-2" rating, which is the lowest possible rating in the test.) In addition, Comparative Sample 8 exhibits much more yellowing than does Example 4.

There is nothing in either reference to suggest that the phosphazene compounds would provide such excellent results compared to the phosphate esters that are described in EP 1 188 092.

The examiner's attention is further drawn particularly to claims 8-10 and 16-18, all of which further require the presence of specified amounts of titanium oxide and a

poly(organo hydrogen siloxane). The presence of these in the required amounts confer additional benefits, which can be seen by comparing Example 4 with Comparative Exmaples 9, 10 and 11. The use of these materials in conjunction with the other ingredients is not taught or suggested by the references.

Respectfully submitted,
GARY C. COHN PLLC

Gary C. Cohn
Registration No. 30,456
Phone: (215) 931-0372
1147 N. 4th St., Unit 6E
Philadelphia, PA 19123